

Application No. 10/632,519  
Amendment dated December 15, 2005  
After Final Office Action of June 15, 2005

10

Docket No.: 08204/0203518-US0/10.156

### REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are currently pending in this application. The Final Office Action dated June 15, 2005, rejected all of the pending Claims. Claim 12 is cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 6, are amended. Also, new Claims 13-29 are added. Consequently, with the entry of this amendment, Claims 1-11 and 12-29 will be pending in this application. The specification and Claim 1 were amended in part to correct informalities. No new matter has been added by any of these amendments.

#### Specification

The Office Action objected to the disclosure because of an informality on page 10, lines 21-22. The appropriate amendment to correct this informality is included herewith. No new matter is added by this amendment.

#### Claim Objections

Claims 1-3 are objected to because in Claim 1, line 14, the phrase "a remote network" doesn't refer to its antecedent. In response, Claim 1 is amended to correct this informality. No new matter is added by this amendment.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 2 and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bartlett et al. (US 2003/0177396 A1).

In regard to independent Claim 1, an amendment has been made to further clarify that the plurality of transport layer connections occur over TCP end-to-end transport layer connections. This amendment clearly renders moot the rejections based on Bartlett.

Furthermore, Bartlett teaches away from employing the claimed TCP transportation layer arrangement. In particular, Bartlett provides for employing an optimized protocol that is separate from the TCP communication protocol at the transportation layer. Also, the cited reference teaches

{S:\08204\0203518-us0\80042961.DOC [REDACTED] } 10

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 10/632,519  
Amendment dated December 15, 2005  
After Final Office Action of June 15, 2005

11

Docket No.: 08204/0203518-US0/10.156

away from the claimed invention by trumpeting the virtues of the optimized protocol over the perceived limitations of TCP. (See Paragraph [0066]. Therefore, as amended, Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the Bartlet reference.

Additionally, Claim 6 has been amended in a manner substantially similar to Claim 1, albeit differently. Consequently, amended Claim 6 is neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 1. Furthermore, dependent Claims 2 and 7-11, are all allowable for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claims 1 and 6 upon which they respectively depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett in view of Dillon et al. (US 6,658,463). In view of the amendments to independent Claim 1, upon which these claims depend, this rejection is now moot. Thus, Claims 3-5 are allowable over the suggested combination of references.

RECT AVALI ARI F COPY

{S:\08204\0203518-us0\80042961.DOC } 11

Application No. 10/632,519  
Amendment dated December 15, 2005  
After Final Office Action of June 15, 2005

12

Docket No.: 08204/0203518-US0/10.156

Conclusion

By the foregoing explanations, Applicants believe that this response has addressed fully all of the concerns expressed in the Final Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: December 15, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

DARBY &amp; DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

{S:\08204\0203518-us0\80042961.DOC 12/15/2005 20:12 FAX 2062628901 } 12